

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-6, 9-19, 21-25, 28-33, 36-50 and 53 remain pending in this application. Independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 38 and 46 have been amended hereby to even more clearly recite features of the present invention. Support for the amendment to each of the claims can be found, for example, in Figures 8A-C and the corresponding description in the specification. For the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Advisory Action, it was indicated that the claims were still not in condition for allowance. The Examiner argued that the claims did not "specify who is performing the verification of the resolution of the trouble ticket." Thus, most of the claims remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,219,648 B1, in view of the article regarding Peregrine's MELBA application ("MELBA"). The remaining claims remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Jones et al. in view of MELBA and further in view of Kidder et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,445,774 B1. To the extent these grounds of rejection are maintained against claims now pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is abundantly clear from the claims, as well as the specification and drawings, that it is the internal personnel, to whom the outsourced personnel are working, that are responsible for performing verification and thereby effecting corresponding

changes in the database. Nevertheless, Applicants have elected to file an RCE and to further amend the claims in an effort to accelerate the prosecution of this application.

More specifically, each of the independent claims now recites that the database stores information relating to whether a resolution of a trouble ticket, proposed by outsourced personnel who work for the organization, has been ~~verified~~ approved by internal personnel for whom the outsourced personnel are working. The “approve” language can be found, for example, in steps 836 and 838 in Figure 8B, which clearly shows the interaction between internal personnel and outsourced personnel, and that the status of a given trouble ticket in the database is not changed until after internal personnel approve or verify what the outsourced personnel has done.

Since MELBA (or any of the other cited prior art) fails to disclose or to suggest the interaction (and, specifically, “approval” limitation) required by the claims of the present application, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Serial No.: 09/604,316
Art Unit: 3623

Attorney's Docket No.: BS99-124
Page 17

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: January 5, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

TIDWELL ET AL.

By: 
Lawrence D. Eisen
Registration No. 41,009

Attachments: None

LDE/dkp